

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Frank Montgoris	Team: Squad #7	CCRB Case #: 201602004	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Wednesday, 03/02/2016 6:15 AM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 73	18 Mo. SOL 9/2/2017	EO SOL 9/2/2017	
Date/Time CV Reported Thu, 03/03/2016 10:26 AM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Wed, 03/09/2016 10:20 AM		
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address			
Witness(es)	Home Address				
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command		
1. DT3 Peter Segerdahl	29719	934719	WARRSEC		
2. DT3 Starlette Chisem	04534	940000	WARRSEC		
Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation			
A.DT3 Starlette Chisem	Abuse: Detective Starlette Chisem entered and searched § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.				
B.DT3 Peter Segerdahl	Abuse: Police Officer Peter Segerdahl entered and searched § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.				

Case Summary

On March 2, 2016, at approximately 6:15 a.m., Det. Starlette Chisem and PO Peter Segerdahl, both from the Brooklyn North Warrant Squad, arrived at § 87(2)(b)'s apartment, located at § 87(2)(b), in Brooklyn, in regards to an I-Card for § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) (As noted on the cover page, PO Segerdahl has since been promoted to Detective.). Since he was an officer at the time of this incident, he will hereto be referred to as "PO." Det. Chisem and PO Segerdahl allegedly entered and searched § 87(2)(b)'s apartment (**Allegations A and B**). No arrests or summonses resulted from this incident.

This case exceeded the 90-day benchmark because documentation regarding the incident took 73 days to gather from IAB.

Mediation, Civil, and Criminal Histories

This case was unsuitable for mediation because § 87(2)(b) had planned to file a civil lawsuit regarding the incident. [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]

As of June 13, 2016, § 87(2)(b) has not filed a Notice of Claim against the City of New York (Board Review 02).

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b) has filed one prior CCRB complaint, § 87(2)(b).
- Det. Chisem has been a member of the NYPD for ten years. Det. Chisem has been the subject of 19 prior allegations stemming from eight cases. There has been one substantiated frisk allegation against Det. Chisem, from CCRB Case #201210114, which resulted in charges. Only one of her prior complaints involved an entry allegation. § 87(2)(g).
- PO Segerdahl has been a member of the NYPD for 11 years. PO Segerdahl has been the subject of ten prior allegations stemming from seven cases, none of which include entry allegations. There have been no substantiated allegations against PO Segerdahl. § 87(2)(g).

Potential Issues

- During her in-person statement, § 87(2)(b) alleged that her uncle, § 87(2)(b) was a witness to the incident. During the course of the investigation, § 87(2)(b) provided a phone statement to the CCRB; however, despite eight calls to his confirmed cell phone and three letters sent to his confirmed residence, § 87(2)(b) was ultimately uncooperative with the investigation. Therefore, the investigation was unable to obtain witness testimony regarding this incident (See IAs).
- During her in-person statement, § 87(2)(b) stated that her apartment building has multiple security cameras in the hallways outside of her apartment. During the course of the investigation, contact was established with § 87(2)(b), the company in charge of the § 87(2)(b), and a subpoena was submitted to obtain security footage. However, despite six follow-up calls and an e-mail, the subpoena was ultimately un-

complied with, and the investigation was unable to obtain video footage for this incident (See IAs).

- During their CCRB interviews, both Det. Chisem and PO Segerdahl testified that they went to § 87(2)(b)'s apartment with two unidentified officers that were not from their command. Neither Det. Chisem nor PO Segerdahl was able to identify these officers, and there was no documentation in either the DD5s or the officers' memo books, indicating the identity of these officers. Furthermore, both Det. Chisem and PO Segerdahl attested that these two officers did not interact with either § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b) and neither officer entered § 87(2)(b)'s apartment. § 87(2)(g) (Board Reviews 06, 07, 10, 11, and 12).

Findings and Recommendations

Explanation of Subject Officer Identification

- § 87(2)(b) alleged in her in-person statement that ten officers entered her apartment, five of whom searched. In his unsworn phone statement, § 87(2)(b) alleged that only three officers entered and searched the apartment during the incident. § 87(2)(g)

Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: Detective Starlette Chisem entered and searched § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.

Allegation B – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Peter Segerdahl entered and searched § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn.

§ 87(2)(b) alleged that she heard officers banging on her front door and opened the door slightly to speak with Det. Chisem, who stated that she had “warrants” for the location. § 87(2)(b) told Det. Chisem that she would let her and PO Segerdahl, who was also at the door, into the apartment after she went and put clothes on. Det. Chisem allegedly put her foot in the threshold of the door, preventing § 87(2)(b) from closing it. § 87(2)(b) walked back towards her bedroom. Approximately ten officers, including Det. Chisem and PO Segerdahl, and eight male uniformed officers, entered the apartment. Det. Chisem stated that they were looking for an individual named § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b). Five white male officers entered the bathroom and the kitchen, looked inside each room, looked inside closets, and then walked out. § 87(2)(b) told the officers that they needed to leave her apartment because she was not the person they were looking for. The officers then left immediately after (Board Review 04).

As discussed in the Potential Issues section, § 87(2)(b) did not provide an in-person statement to the CCRB. In his unsworn phone statement, he alleged that, when the officers knocked on the front door, § 87(2)(b) went to the door and spoke to three police officers who stated that they were looking for someone, but § 87(2)(b) did not recall who the officers stated that they were looking for. § 87(2)(b) told the officers to hold on until she got dressed, and walked away from the partially opened door. The three officers then entered the

apartment. They looked around in the living room and bedroom for the individual that they had said they were looking for, and then left shortly thereafter (Board Review 05).

Det. Chisem, who testified that the incident occurred inside of § 87(2)(b) instead of § 87(2)(b) acknowledged that, regardless of the apartment number, she was, in fact, inside of § 87(2)(b)'s apartment on the incident date. She, along with PO Segerdahl and two unidentified officers, arrived at the apartment because of an arrest warrant for § 87(2)(b), who reportedly lived in the apartment, and an I-Card for § 87(2)(b) whose mother, § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) reportedly lived in the apartment in recent past. Det. Chisem knocked on the door and identified herself. A male individual, identified by investigation as § 87(2)(b) opened the door. Det. Chisem asked § 87(2)(b) the last names of the individuals who lived at the apartment. § 87(2)(b) told Det. Chisem that he didn't know, and that the officers could come in while he found out. Det. Chisem and PO Segerdahl, the only two officers to enter the apartment during the incident, then entered and stayed in the living room, which was right past the front door. § 87(2)(b) who smelled like alcohol and was slurring her speech, was irate towards the officers. § 87(2)(b) denied knowing § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) and told the officers to "get the fuck out." Det. Chisem, not wanting to make matters worse, then left the apartment with PO Segerdahl. The officers never asked to search the apartment, and a search of the apartment was never conducted (Board Review 06).

PO Segerdahl, who confirmed that the incident occurred at § 87(2)(b), also acknowledged being inside § 87(2)(b)'s apartment. He testified that Det. Chisem had identified herself and stated to § 87(2)(b) that she was conducting an investigation, and § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) told the officers, "Come in." § 87(2)(b) told Det. Chisem that he did not know the individuals that the officers were looking for. § 87(2)(b) who smelled like liquor and appeared intoxicated, came from the bedroom. She also stated that she did not know the individuals that the officers were looking for and told the officers to leave her apartment, which the officers did. During his CCRB interview, PO Segerdahl was shown a copy of the DD5s, which noted that a search of § 87(2)(b) was conducted. PO Segerdahl testified that Det. Chisem incorrectly documented the DD5s because § 87(2)(b) was never searched (Board Review 07).

The investigation obtained the arrest warrant for § 87(2)(b) which listed his address as "§ 87(2)(b)." The investigation also obtained the I-Card for § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) which listed his address as "§ 87(2)(b)." The I-Card also notes that § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b)'s mother, also lives at "§ 87(2)(b)" (Board Reviews 08 and 09).

The DD5s, which were prepared by Det. Chisem for this incident, were obtained by the investigation. It is noted in the summary section that the officers visited § 87(2)(b) and that an individual who identified herself as "§ 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b)" stated that she did not know who Tyrone § 87(2)(b) or his mother was. It is also stated that "§ 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b)" consented to a search of the apartment, which yielded negative results (Board Review 10).

The memo books of both Det. Chisem and PO Segerdahl were obtained by the investigation. While both officers noted an entry in regards to visiting the location, there are no entries in either memo book documenting an entry or a search of § 87(2)(b)'s apartment (Board Reviews 11 and 12).

§ 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) arrest warrant, which Det. Chisem testified as being a reason the officers went to the apartment, lists § 87(2)(b), making it evident that, although the warrant was active for the apartment building, it corresponded to a different apartment number than § 87(2)(b)'s apartment. Furthermore, § 87(2)(b)'s active I-Card corresponded to a different address that was not even on the same street as § 87(2)(b)'s apartment. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

Squad: 7

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print	Date
Squad Leader:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date
Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date